

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Official Action dated April 23, 2007 for the above identified patent application.

At page 2, paragraph 1 of the Official Action, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure on the grounds that the description of the "lower profile height" on page 2 appears to be inaccurate in that the lower height of webs (12, 13) is not shown in the figures. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusions. The height of the webs (12, 13) illustrated by Figure 4 (which is a cross section taken through one end of Figure 1) is greater than the height of the webs (12, 13) illustrated by Figure 3 (which is a cross section taken through the center of Figure 2). Therefore, the description at page 2 of the Specification, that the central portion 22 has a lower profile height than the side portions (20, 21), is accurate.

The Specification, at page 2, line 24, has also been objected to on the grounds that the term "make" should be "makes". In response to this objection, Applicant has amended the Specification as suggested by the Examiner. An additional minor correction has also been made.

At page 2, paragraph 3 of the Official Action, Claims 1 - 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite. The basis for the formal grounds of rejection is discussed in the Official Action.

Applicant has amended the form of Claims 1 - 3 to overcome the formal grounds of rejection raised in the Official Action. As correctly noted by the Examiner, Claims 1 and 2 incorrectly recited that the edge bends towards the cover, and not away from the cover. Claims 1 and 2 have been revised to recite that the "bent edge" is bent away from the cover, and not towards the cover. This error in Claims 1 and 2 occurred as a result of the translation error in International Publication WO 2005/054011 A, corresponding to International Patent Application No. PCT/SE2003/001847. The present application is the United States National Phase of the corresponding PCT application.

The amendment to Claims 1 and 2 to recite that the bent edge is bent away from the cover is expressly supported at page 2, last full paragraph, lines 4 - 6 of the original Specification which expressly recites: "...The side flanges...have their edges 23, 24 bent in the direction away from the cover...". Therefore, the revisions to Claims 1 and 2 to recite that the edge is bent away from the cover are expressly supported by the original disclosure of this patent application, and now render Claims 1 and 2 consistent with both the original Specification and drawings.

The form of Claims 1 - 3 have also been amended to overcome the other formal grounds of rejection raised at page 2, paragraph 3 of the Official Action. With regard to Claim 4, the recitations of upper and lower side flanges now have proper antecedent basis in parent Claim 3, as amended herein.

At page 3, paragraph 5 of the Official Action, Claims 1 - 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by the Jonsson published U.S. Appl. 2002/0121797. The published application corresponds to U.S. Patent No. 6,554,345, which also corresponds to International Patent Application PCT/SE98/01870. This PCT application was cited in the International Search Report for the PCT international patent application corresponding to the present United States patent application in Category A, indicating that it was not considered to be relevant to the PCT claims, which correspond to the claims of the present United States patent application.

In any event, Figures 3, 5, 8, and 9 of the drawings of the applied prior art reference illustrate a beam having no upstanding edges at all. The other drawing figures of the applied prior art reference illustrate beams having upstanding edges along their entire length. Thus, the applied prior art reference does not teach (or suggest) a beam having a central portion with a lower profile height than side portions of the beam, and a bent edge extending along substantially only the lower central portion of the beam to provide reinforcement for

the lower central portion of the beam, as disclosed and claimed by Applicant.

Claims 1 and 2 have been revised to expressly recite that "substantially only" the central portion of the beam has reinforcement means in the form of a bent edge extending along at least one side flange of the central portion. Although this feature of the invention is covered by the language of the original claims (i.e., "unlike the side portions"), it is now positively recited in the revised claims. This feature of the invention is disclosed by original drawing Figures 1 and 2 which illustrate bent edges 23, 24 extending primarily along only the center portion 22 of the beam, and by page 2, 4th paragraph of the original application.

It is well established that a rejection of a claim as being anticipated by a prior art reference requires the Patent & Trademark Office to establish a strict identity of invention between a single applied prior art reference and the rejected claim. Stated in other words, a rejection of a claim as being anticipated by a prior art reference is improper unless a single prior art reference discloses all features of the claim, as arranged in the claim. See, for example, Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

In the instant case, independent Claims 1 and 2 disclose structure, and arrangement of structure (a bent edge extending

substantially along only the lower central portion of a beam) not taught (or suggested) by the applied prior art reference. As noted above, the prior art reference discloses only beams without any upstanding edges at all, or with beams having upstanding edges extending along their entire length. The applied prior art reference does not teach (or suggest) the specific structure and structural arrangement defined by independent Claims 1 and 2, when all positively recited features of these claims are considered in the patentability determination.

For the reasons discussed herein, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark P. Stone
Reg. No. 27,954
Attorney for Applicant
25 Third Street, 4th Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
(203) 329-3355